UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR 13 - 662 - RS
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME) UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT) FILED
Clifford Dale Borcovich, et al. Defendant.	OCT 1 1 2013
Defendant.)
speedy Irial Act from 10/11, 2013 to	on 10/11, 2013, the Courte No. 10/10 and the Courte No. 10/10 and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance would See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	ld be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the	ex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of exprosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial shed by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
taking into account the exercise of	ld deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance wou counsel's other scheduled case con See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	ld unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, giver nmitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
Failure to grant a continuance wou necessary for effective preparation. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	ld unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
DATED: <u>14/11</u> 3	JOSEPH C. SPERO United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED:	- Charl
Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney